REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for participating in the telephone interview on July 13, 2006. A proposed amendment of claim 1, and the primary reference relied on in the Office Action, were discussed. No agreement was reached. In response to the Office Action dated April 17, 2006, Applicant is amending claims 1, 3-5, 11, 12, 14 and 16-17. Claims 1-20 are pending, of which claims 1, 12 and 14 are independent. Favorable reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The independent claims have been amended to recite that a displayed document has an intrinsic association with another document, and that the user-selectable command (which displays the other document) identifies this intrinsic association. Support for the amendment is found on page 9, line 23—page 10, line 19, where its is described that one document can be a follow-up of another document, and that the follow-up document can in turn have its own follow-up documents. The association can be in form of an identifier, for example. The amended claim language regarding the identification of the intrinsic association is supported by Figures 1A-D and the description on page 6, lines 8-15 and page 7, lines 11-18. There it is described that, in the menu 160, the user-selectable command 170 is included under a heading "Is a Follow-Up of:" and the user-selectable command 195 is included under a heading "Associated Follow-Up:". Thus, these user-selectable commands identify the respective intrinsic associations that exist. Some dependent claims have been amended to conform to these changes. Also, the phrase "the plurality of user-selectable commands" in dependent claim 5 has been corrected; support for this amendment is found in dependent claim 3, which provides antecedent basis for this phrase. No new matter is added.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7-10, 12-15 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,313,855 (Shuping). Similarly, claims 3, 11 and 16 were rejected over Shuping in view of U.S. 6,489,975 (Patil). Similarly, claims 4, 5 and 17 were rejected over Shuping in view of Patil and U.S. 5,895,470 (Pirolli). Applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration of the amended claims in view of the interview discussion and the following remarks.

Applicant : Aurobinda Pradhan   Attorney's Docket No.: 15609-044001 / 2003P00966
Serial No. : 10/821,073   US
Filed   : April 8, 2004
Page   : 7 of 8

Independent claim 1 is a method relating to associated documents. The current amendment of claim 1 is identical to a proposed amendment that was discussed during the interview, except for the term "intrinsic", which was suggested in that discussion. Amended independent claim 12 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 1. Amended independent claim 14 is another computer program product claim drawn to a graphical user interface, and it has been amended similarly to the other independent claims. Each claim now recites that the displayed document has an intrinsic association with the other document, and that the user-selectable command identifies this intrinsic association. Shuping, Patil or Pirolli do not disclose or suggest this feature.

As discussed in the interview, Shuping teaches the presentation of a three-sided panel, where the middle panel shows a current web page, the left panel shows pages linking to that web page, and the right panel shows web pages linked to by the current page. In other words, the pages in Shuping are associated by hyperlinks, not intrinsic associations. There is no description in Shuping of two documents having an intrinsic association that is identified by a user-selectable command. Patil was cited as disclosing backward and forward buttons for showing past and future pages. Pirolli was cited as teaching a system that obtains topology and usage information for documents in order to classify/categorize.

The independent claims (1, 12 and 14) all recite that the displayed document has an intrinsic association with the other document, and that the user-selectable command identifies this intrinsic association. Shuping does not disclose or suggest this feature. The remaining claims all depend directly or indirectly from either of these claims. Favorable consideration of the amended claims is requested.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this

paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

This amendment is filed within the shortened statutory period and no fee is therefore due. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/14/06

J. Richard Soderberg
Reg. No. 43,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696

60357828.doc